



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/212,292	12/16/98	JUN S	F55281

WM21/1012
ROBERT E. BUSHNELL
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
1522 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20005-1202

EXAMINER
ZAMANI, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/212,292

Applicant(s)
Sung-Gon Jun

Examiner
Ali Zamani

Art Unit
2674



— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 14, 2001

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applica

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2674

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miichi (US Pat. No. 5,880,745) in view of Cho (US Pat. No. 6,198,468).

3. In regard to claims 1-2 and 9-10, Miichi discloses a flat panel display information including video data synchronizing data from a host (15) processing digital in a serial digital communication, comprising: a receiver (45) for reconstructing said display information; a digital-to analog converter (50) for converting said video data to a corresponding video signal and an output terminal for externally transferring said signal and analog video signal to an analog display (Fig. 5, col. 8, lines 41-66). Miichi teaches that the signals inputted from the personal computer (15) through the cable (17) are separated into R (red), G (green), and B (blue) image

Art Unit: 2674

signals, a horizontal (H) and a vertical (V) synchronizing signal in the input circuit (35)(Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 6-67). Miichi also teaches that the image signal source is realized by a personal, and the personal computer generates an image signal on the basis of an input signal from the connected input device means and the control signal corresponding to the image signal source can be supplied to the image signal source regardless of the types of image signal source. Miichi substantially teaches the above claimed limitations except for teaching a “synchronizing signal generator and signal conversion without utilizing an analog-to-digital converter or PLL”. However, Cho teaches a first external horizontal signal generator (86) which generate the synchronous signal from corresponding to the display mode (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the signal generator of Cho in the display device of Miichi to provide a flat panel display which display digital information supplied by a digital data processing device. The combination of Miichi and Cho fails to teach a signal conversion without utilizing any analog-to-digital converter (ADC) or PLL circuit for signal conversion to perform the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claim 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miichi in view of Rokunohe et al. (US Pat. No. 4,549,175).

In regard to claim 3-8, Miichi is discussed above. Miichi substantially shows the above claimed limitations except for a “deflection signal generator”. However, Rokunohe discloses an

Art Unit: 2674

image transmission apparatus includes a synchronizing signal generator (17), for generating horizontal and vertical synchronizing signal when raster scanning is made on a CRT (20), an deflection signal generator (62), a luminescent signal generator (63), a video amplifier (64). Rockunohe is cited to show the concept of using a dfection signal generator (62) for receiving synchronizing signal output from synchronizing signal generator (17) via output terminal and for generating deflection signal is old. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the signal dfection of Rockunohe in the display device of Miichi to provide a flat panel display with means for connecting to an analog display, which make a convenient presentation to many people.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lim, Bang and Suga et al. are made of record to show various types of flat panel display information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Zamani whose telephone number is (703) 308-6414. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A. Hjerepe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 09212292

Page 5

Art Unit: 2674

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.

Ali Zamani

October 11, 2001


STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600